

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 8, 21 and 24 are amended without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 24, 27, 28, 30 and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 24, 27, 28, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,343) ("Epstein et al.") in view of Kanevsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,219,407) ("Kanevsky et al."). Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims now include limitations not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, each of the independent claims is amended to require that determining the identity of each of the one or more callers in each of the one or more voice mail messages by two steps. The first step is comparing speech signals from each of the one or more voice mail messages with one or more caller speaker models and the next step requires an analysis of the content of the one or more voice mail messages. Support for this limitation is found in the last paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action as well as the first full paragraph on page 11 of the specification in which the specification teaches that the actual content of the voice mail messages may also be used by the present system to aid in determining the callers identity. The example provided in the specification is that the caller may provide some identifying content in the voice mail message such as their name and/or last name. Of course other content may be utilized to aid in determining the identity of the caller such as a particular restaurant discussed or other people discussed in the content of the voice mail message. Applicants respectfully submit that in no place in the prior art did they include this particular feature. For example in Epstein et al., they teach in column 7 that only teach the verbal information from the user is processed and compared with previously stored speaker models for the purpose of identification. There is no

teaching or suggestion in column 7 regarding analyzing the content of each of the one or more voice mail messages in conjunction with comparing the speech signals with caller speaker models to determine the identity of a speaker. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 24, 27, 28, 30 and 31 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

Rejection of Claims 8 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 8 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein et al. in view of Kanevsky et al. and further in view of Murveit et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,766,295) ("Murveit et al."). Applicants respectfully submit that inasmuch as claims 8 and 29 each depend from an allowable claim, that these claims are patentable and in condition for allowance.


Applicants also note that they do not acquiesce to there being sufficient motivation or suggestion to combine any of the references in the Office Action. However, inasmuch as we have added a limitation which overcomes the references, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections and objections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If necessary, the Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge or credit the **Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP, Account No. 14-1437** for any deficiency or overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August ³⁰~~29~~, 2007

By: 

Correspondence Address:

Thomas A. Restaino
Reg. No. 33,444
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Thomas M. Isaacson

Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,166
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433